

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-2, 5-13, and 15-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 10 are amended. The Applicant thanks the Office for a detailed analysis presented in the Office Action.

Claims 1, 5-11 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,825 to Kennedy et al. (hereinafter, "Kennedy") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,509,048 to Meidan et al. (hereinafter, "Meidan") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0066115 to Wendelrup (hereinafter, "Wendelrup") and in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0068605 to Stanley (hereinafter, "Stanley").

Claims 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Meidan in further view of Wendelrup in further view of Stanley and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,489,934 to Klausner (hereinafter, "Klausner").

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Meidan in further view of Wendelrup in further view of Stanley and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,618 to Lebby et al. (hereinafter, "Lebby").

Arguments

Independent claim 1 recites an "[a]pparatus for displaying information from a portable communications device, having a data output port and a scrollable display, on a remote projection display device having a data input port, the apparatus comprising (emphasis added):

1 a first data port associated with a cradle for receiving the
2 portable communications device, the first data port adapted to be
3 coupled to the data output port of the portable communications
4 device, the first data port for receiving remote data from the portable
5 communications device; and

6 a second data port that is adapted to be coupled to the data
7 input port of the remote projection display device, the second data
8 port for automatically, upon placement of the portable
9 communications device into the cradle, providing to the remote
10 projection display device a representation of the remote data
11 received from the portable communications device; and

12 wherein the apparatus is configured to receive scrolling
13 commands from a scroll controller, the scroll controller being that is
14 adapted to cause the remote projection display device to provide a
15 scrolling display of information that corresponds to the scrollable
16 display of the portable communications device;

17 wherein the scroll controller comprises a control device that is
18 integrated into an automobile steering wheel and is adapted to be
19 electrically connected to the remote projection display device; and

20 *wherein the apparatus is also configured to receive*
21 *commands from a display controller,* the display controller being
22 adapted to cause the remote projection display device to turn on and
23 off the displayed information;

24 wherein the display controller also comprises a control device
25 that is integrated into the automobile steering wheel and is adapted
to be electrically connected to the remote projection display device.

19 In making out a rejection of claim 1, the Office states that the claim is
20 obvious in view of the combination of Kennedy, Meidan, Wendelrup and Stanley.
21 (*Office Action of 05/18/06, p. 3-5*). The Applicant respectfully traverses the
22 rejection. Nevertheless, the Applicant has amended claim 1 for the sole purpose
23 of furthering prosecution.

As amended, claim 1 recites an apparatus that is “configured to receive commands from a display controller, the display controller being adapted to cause the remote projection display device to turn on and off the displayed information; wherein the display controller also comprises a control device that is integrated into the automobile steering wheel and is adapted to be electrically connected to the remote projection display device”. The amendment is fully supported in the specification as filed. The Office’s attention is specifically directed to at least page 5, lines 6-12, page 6, lines 23-27, as well as Figs. 1 and 2. The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references have been shown to teach or suggest the newly-added “display controller”.

For example, Kennedy describes a hands-free wireless communication apparatus for use in a vehicle. Kennedy is not cited to teach an apparatus that is configured to receive commands from a display controller, nor does Kennedy teach such an apparatus. Meidan, meanwhile, describes a mobile radiotelephone which facilitates usage thereof by a user while also operating a vehicle. Again, Meidan is not cited for nor does Meidan teach an apparatus configured to receive commands from a display controller. Wendelrup, which teaches a type of portable communications device, is similarly not cited for nor related to an apparatus configured to receive commands from a display controller.

Finally, Stanley describes a mechanical user-interface for a wireless communications device that enables a motor-vehicle operator to operate the communications device while keeping both hands on the steering wheel. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Stanley is not cited for nor does Stanley teach “wherein the apparatus is also configured to receive commands from a display controller, the display controller being adapted to cause the remote

1 projection display device to turn on and off the displayed information [and]
2 wherein the display controller also comprises a control device that is integrated
3 into the automobile steering wheel and is adapted to be electrically connected to
4 the remote projection display device”, as recited in Applicant’s claim.

5 For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that the Kennedy-Meidan-
6 Wendelrup-Stanley combination has not been shown to support a § 103 rejection
7 of claim 1. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103 rejection
8 be withdrawn.

9 **Dependent claims 2 and 5-9** depend from claim 1 and, by virtue of this
10 dependency, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to these
11 claims. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with
12 those of claim 1, define devices not taught or suggested by the cited references.

13 **Independent claim 10** recites an apparatus for hands-free communication
14 using a portable communications device, the apparatus adapted to receive remote
15 data from the portable communications device via a wireless telecommunications
16 link, the portable communications device having an externally accessible data
17 output port, the apparatus comprising (emphasis added):

18 a housing that is adapted to receive the portable
19 communications device;

20 a sensor for detecting placement of the portable
21 communications device into the housing;

22 a first interface for coupling the data output port of the
23 portable communications device to the housing;

24 a second interface for coupling the housing to a data input
25 port of a remote projection display device; and

1 a processor for receiving the remote data from the portable
2 communications device, converting the received remote data to a
3 format displayable by a remote projection display device, and
4 forwarding the converted remote data to the remote projection
display device via the second interface for automatic display upon
detection of placement of the portable communications device into
the housing;

5 wherein the portable communications device includes a
6 scrolling capability, and the processor includes a scroll controller
7 that receives scrolling commands from a remote scroll control device
8 that is adapted to be integrated into an automobile steering wheel
9 and adapted to cause the remote projection display device to provide
a scrolling display of the converted remote data based on the
scrolling commands; and

10 *wherein the processor is configured to receive commands*
11 *from a remote toggle controller, the remote toggle controller being*
12 *adapted to cause the remote projection display device to toggle the*
display of the remote data between on and off states in response to
actuation of the remote toggle controller.

13
14 As amended, claim 10 recites an apparatus that is “wherein the processor is
15 configured to receive commands from a remote toggle controller, the remote
16 toggle controller being adapted to cause the remote projection display device to
17 toggle the display of the remote data between on and off states in response to
18 actuation of the remote toggle controller”. The amendment is fully supported in
19 the specification as filed. The Office’s attention is specifically directed to at least
20 page 5, lines 6-12, page 6, lines 23-27, as well as Figs. 1 and 2. The Applicant
21 respectfully submits that none of the cited references have been shown to teach or
22 suggest the newly-added “remote toggle controller”.

23 For example, Kennedy describes a hands-free wireless communication
24 apparatus for use in a vehicle. Kennedy is not cited to teach an apparatus that is
25 configured to receive commands from a remote toggle controller, nor does

1 Kennedy teach such an apparatus. Meidan, meanwhile, describes a mobile
2 radiotelephone which facilitates usage thereof by a user while also operating a
3 vehicle. Again, Meidan is not cited for nor does Meidan teach an apparatus
4 configured to receive commands from a remote toggle controller. Wendelrup,
5 which teaches a type of portable communications device, is similarly not cited for
6 nor related to an apparatus configured to receive commands from a remote toggle
7 controller.

8 Finally, Stanley describes a mechanical user-interface for a wireless
9 communications device that enables a motor-vehicle operator to operate the
10 communications device while keeping both hands on the steering wheel.
11 Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Stanley is not cited for nor does
12 Stanley teach “wherein the processor is configured to receive commands from a
13 remote toggle controller, the remote toggle controller being adapted to cause the
14 remote projection display device to toggle the display of the remote data between
15 on and off states in response to actuation of the remote toggle controller”, as
16 recited in Applicant’s claim.

17 For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that the Kennedy-Meidan-
18 Wendelrup-Stanley combination has not been shown to support a § 103 rejection
19 of claim 10. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103 rejection
20 be withdrawn.

21 **Dependent claims 11-13 and 15-16** depend from claim 10 and, by virtue
22 of this dependency, the above comments directed to claim 10 apply equally to
23 these claims. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together
24 with those of claim 10, define devices not taught or suggested by the cited
25 references

1 **Conclusion**

2 The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the
3 rejections of claims 1-2, 5-13 and 15-16, and favorable action on the subject
4 application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this
5 case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned agent to resolve the
6 issue.

7
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9 Date: 8/16/06

10 By: 

11 Robert G. Hartman
12 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
13 Reg. No. 58,970
14 (509) 324-9256 ext. 265